



## **Enterprise Architecture Standards Exception Request Document**

based on the  
Judicial Project Investment Justification (JPIJ)

***Specific Exception Being Requested:***     ***Agave Case Management System***

***Title of Related Project:***     ***Pima County Consolidated Justice Court Case Management System Replacement Project***

***Prepared by:***

<b><i>Name</i></b>	<b><i>Charles Drake</i></b>
<b><i>Court</i></b>	<b><i>Pima County Consolidated Justice Court</i></b>
<b><i>Date</i></b>	<b><i>October 1, 2012</i></b>

## Goals of the Information Technology Enterprise Architecture Standards:

- Improve interoperability and integration
- Improve productivity
- Maximize reusability
- Reduce overall cost to the Branch as a whole
- Enable leveraging in procurement

## Principles Underlying Requests for Exceptions to Statewide Standards:

- City/County investment has already been made (apart from the court) that reduces the cost to the court.
- Overall cost (total cost of ownership) is reduced from that of implementing the statewide standard. This savings must be balanced against the potential impacts to the broader Branch initiatives. Specific areas to be considered are: financial leverage, integration, support, and training.
- Overall risk is reduced from that of implementing the statewide standard,
- The local IT function is/will be providing support,
- The technology demonstrates long-term viability. This must include the consideration of the vendor's viability and future costs to evolve the technology solution.
- Substantially greater productivity is enabled through adoption of a local standard.

**By submittal of this exception request, the court agrees to bear any later costs at the local level necessary to integrate the exception component or system with a statewide standard component or core system.**

With the preceding statements in mind, please respond to the following questions regarding the exception component or system:

***Q1. How will information from the system or component be exchanged with or integrated into core state systems, as applicable, in the event the exception is granted?***

A1. Our court currently exchanges information with core state systems, and adopting Agave will not immediately change those interfaces.

*ECitations and Photo Enforcement:* We receive via MQ from AOC servers the citation information from local county agencies and Department of Public Safety (DPS). The XML files are captured and saved on a file server. A batch process then uploads the data into staging tables in a Microsoft SQL Server. A second process takes data from the staging tables and creates cases in our current case management system. The only change to this system is that the case initiation process will be replaced with a stored procedure that will create cases in Agave.

*MVD Reporting:* Currently we have an automated batch process read data from our case management system, format the data into Motor Vehicle Division (MVD) specific file formats and send the data to AOC to pass on to MVD. The only change to this system will be modifying the stored procedure so that it reads data from the Agave database.

*Built in Data Exchanges:* The Superior Court in Pima County and Pima County Clerk of the Superior Court also exchange information with core state systems and those interfaces will not be affected by PCCJC adopting the Agave system. Agave sends civil data to the AOC's Central Case Index, and there is a hook to Agave's electronic document management system (EDMS) for AOC processes to pull images. It is not part of the current project plan, but there is a great possibility that our court can modify the same technology for information exchanges with state systems.

***Q2. What is the long-term support strategy? Who will provide support for the excepted system or component? What service level agreements or intergovernmental agreements are in place to ensure acceptable support is maintained?***

A2. We will be able to modify and extend the system to support the needs of the court for years with this platform. As court needs change or legislation is enacted, we will be able to immediately develop scope, project plan and start development efforts. We will have total control over all aspects of the change process, including the ability to control budgets, scopes and timelines. Our IT department and managers have a great working relationship, and a history of developing custom applications for our court. We can develop synergies with Pima County Superior Court's and Clerk of the Superior Court's IT, and work with them on changes for new AOC rules and statewide initiatives. We will be able to take advantage of their location directly across the street from our court. We will be able to work with other Pima county partners on local enhancements and improved data interchanges.

Documentation is very important to support any system. The Superior Court and Clerk of the Superior Court possess an abundance of documentation on the Agave system. Our project plan includes writers that will enhance, extend and standardize the Agave documentation for our court. It will include data flow diagrams, process diagrams, database diagrams, data dictionaries, use cases and help files for staff. The extensive documentation is essential reference for current IT staff and valuable training material for new IT staff.

Industry recognized standards, and the AOC's Enterprise Architectural Standards are also important to supporting a system. The Agave platform is built using the Microsoft .NET framework, and is hosted on Microsoft SQL servers and application servers. We have Microsoft support contracts in place for this infrastructure. Our staff has completed hundreds of classroom hours learning to develop and support these technologies, and our job requirements specify that any new IT staff have Microsoft specific experience.

**Q3. By how much is the five-year total cost to the Branch reduced by the exception?**

Show a comparison of costs between the state standard and the requested exception below. Place the summary answer in A3G. For help with filling in tables, refer to instructions that appear in Section III of the JPIJ document (long version).

**A3A. Development Costs for Current State Standard**

Fiscal Year						
Description	FY13-14	FY14-15	FY15-16	FY16-17	FY17-18	Total*
The number of FTE and third-party positions						
1. IT FTE Positions	1.8	1.8				(Do not use)
2. User FTE Positions	.4	.4				
3. Professional and Outside Positions						
4. Total Positions *	2.2	2.2				
The development costs in thousands (\$000)						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$100	\$100				\$200
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$19	\$18				\$37
7. IT Services (AmCad )	\$150	\$150				\$300
8. Hardware						
9. Software						
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. AmCad Maintenance Fee	\$12	\$12				\$24
13. Other						
14. Total**	\$280	\$280				\$561

\* Items 1 through 3 must be described in **Appendix A. Roles and Responsibilities.**

\*\* Items 7 through 13 must be substantiated in **Appendix B. Itemized List with Costs.**

**A3B. Operating Costs for Current State Standard**

Fiscal Year						
Description	FY13-14	FY14-15	FY15-16	FY16-17	FY17-18	Total**
The number of FTE and third-party positions						
1. IT FTE	8.2	8.2	10	10	10	(Do not use)
2. User FTE						
3. Professional & Outside Positions						
4. Total Positions *	8.2	8.2	10	10	10	
The operating costs in thousands (\$000)						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$474	\$485	\$597	\$609	\$621	\$2,786
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)						
7. IT Services (Current, then AmCad)	\$26	\$26	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$202
8. Hardware						
9. Software						
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees (AmCad and OnBase)	\$13	\$13	\$133	\$139	\$145	\$443
13. Other						
14. Total**	\$513	\$524	\$780	\$798	\$816	\$3,431

\* Items 1 through 3 must be described in ***Appendix A. Roles and Responsibilities.***

\*\* Items 7 through 13 must be substantiated in ***Appendix B. Itemized List with Costs.***

**A3C. Total Project Cost for Implementing Current State Standard**

<i>Fiscal Year (\$000)</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY13-14</i>	<i>FY14-15</i>	<i>FY15-16</i>	<i>FY16-17</i>	<i>FY17-18</i>	<i>Total</i>
1. Development Costs	\$280	\$280				\$561
2. Operating Costs	\$513	\$524	\$780	\$798	\$816	\$3,431
3. Total Project Costs	\$793	\$804	\$780	\$798	\$816	\$3,992

**A3D. Development Costs for Proposed Exception**

Fiscal Year						
Description	FY12-13	FY13-14	FY14-15	FY15-16	FY16-17	Total*
The number of FTE and third-party positions						
1. IT FTE Positions	1.8	1.8				(Do not use)
2. User FTE Positions	.4	.4				
3. Professional and Outside Positions	.8	.8				
4. Total Positions *	3.0	3.0				
The development costs in thousands (\$000)						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$100	\$100				\$200
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$19	\$18				\$37
7. IT Services (Contract )	\$133	\$132				\$265
8. Hardware						
9. Software	\$2					\$2
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees						
13. Other						
14. Total**	\$254	\$250				\$504

\* Items 1 through 3 must be described in *Appendix A. Roles and Responsibilities*.

\*\* Items 7 through 13 must be substantiated in *Appendix B. Itemized List with Costs*.



**A3E. Operating Costs for Proposed Exception**

Fiscal Year						
Description	FY12-13	FY13-14	FY14-15	FY15-16	FY16-17	Total**
The number of FTE and third-party positions						
1. IT FTE	8.2	8.2	10	10	10	(Do not use)
2. User FTE						
3. Professional & Outside Positions						
4. Total Positions *	8.2	8.2	10	10	10	
The operating costs in thousands (\$000)						
5. IT FTE COST (Include ERE)	\$474	\$485	\$597	\$609	\$621	\$2,786
6. User FTE COST (Include ERE)						
7. IT Services (Current)	\$26	\$26	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$52
8. Hardware						
9. Software						
10. Communications						
11. Facilities						
12. Licensing and Maintenance Fees	\$13	\$13	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26
13. Other						
14. Total**	\$513	\$524	\$597	\$609	\$621	\$2,864

\* Items 1 through 3 must be described in ***Appendix A. Roles and Responsibilities.***

\*\* Items 7 through 13 must be substantiated in ***Appendix B. Itemized List with Costs.***

**A3F. Total Project Cost for Implementing Proposed Exception**

**1**

<i>Fiscal Year (\$000)</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY12-13</i>	<i>FY13-14</i>	<i>FY14-15</i>	<i>FY15-16</i>	<i>FY16-17</i>	<i>Total</i>
1. Development Costs	\$254	\$250				\$504
2. Operating Costs	\$513	\$524	\$597	\$609	\$621	\$2,864
3. Total Project Costs	\$767	\$774	\$597	\$609	\$621	\$3,368

**A3G. Total cost reduction is the difference of \$624,000 between A3C 5-year total and A3F 5-year total.**

133

**Q4. Will the exception component or system stand alone?**

If yes, will its functionality be what other courts would realistically desire today or in the near future?

A4. Yes, it will be a standalone system.

**Q5. How will the exception component or system enable productivity gains beyond those of the state standard?**

A5. Because our court is unique in the state, the exception system will enable productivity gains beyond the state standard in three ways: ease of use, lower costs of ownership, and extensibility.

Key PCJCC staff has spent hundreds of hours with the Agave system, AJACS and Tempe's system and has found Agave much easier to use than the others. They report that the system is visually and functionally designed to aid the user with their tasks. Our finance staff determined that the functionality offered in Agave will save dozens of person-hours per month on common tasks such as financial adjustments on cases. Business practices and tasks will take less time to complete and increase the volume of transactions per day. Payment receipting clerks will have fewer windows or screens to look at when processing payments from customers, decreasing time per customer and increasing efficiency. With minimal training, they were able to feel their way around the system and find information where they expected it. We have not been able to successfully navigate through AJACS version 3.9 and with regard to the civil module have been advised by AOC staff that it will have to be configured by the court. The AJACS project director has indicated that the civil component will work for a one judge justice court but does not have the functionality to meet PCJCC requirements.

We feel there is considerable cost savings with the Agave system. Initially, we will save the annual support for our current CMS, the annual support for Hyland OnBase since we will use the built in EDMS for Agave. We will also save on initial development and implementation costs, and hundreds of thousands of dollars per year on system annual support fees compared AJACS. We will further save on implementation costs since we can control time, scope and resources for projects, and we will not depend on a vendor's availability and competing projects. The savings in reduced time and effort for staff to perform common functions will be significant, and our staff will be able to spend their time in more productive customer service efforts rather than double data entry or correcting system errors.

The cost of ownership for AJACS will increase year by year. We currently have Hyland OnBase, since that is the EDMS that AJACS is designed for, and the maintenance/licensing fees are about \$13,000 per year. We also have a certified OnBase Advanced Administrator and API who are required to recertify every two years at a cost. Adding additional users for scanning costs \$300 per license and a percentage of that is added to the annual fees. In the Statement of Work provided to Mesa Municipal Court, AmCad quoted \$120,000 for the first year of system support and increasing that to 5% per year; in year 5 that support will be over \$145,000 and in year 10 that will be over \$186,000. Moreover, every change request we make will have unspecified contract costs. A quote for installation of a test/dev system was \$10,000, and it is not difficult to see how development costs could be much more for each request. For Mesa, AmCad quoted \$20,000 to nearly \$60,000 per request for including Mesa specific items in their system. Setting aside the dollar amount of the change request, there are hidden costs associated with staff time used in workarounds or shadow systems that provide the functionality not found in the system.

We have developed a 12-18 month project plan for development and implementation of Agave, a much shorter timeframe than what we believe is realistic with AJACS. We have the readily available funding, with contingency, to support the development efforts without external grant funds. We have available contractors with years of experience developing and extending the Agave system for Clerk of the Court and Superior Court. We have an in house staff of developers, analysts, and subject matter experts in our court that have a deep understanding of our uniqueness and business processes, and our IT staff has in-depth knowledge of the programming language and technology.

We will be able to modify and extend the system to support the needs of the court for years with this platform. As court needs change, we will be able to immediately develop scope, project plan and start development efforts. We will have total control over all aspects of the change process, including the ability to control budgets, scopes and timelines. Our IT departments and managers have a great working relationship, and a history of developing custom applications for our court. We can develop synergies with Superior Court's and Clerk of the Court's IT, and work with them on changes for new AOC rules and statewide initiatives that affect all courts and Agave. We will be able to work with other Pima county partners on local enhancements and improved data interchanges.

The Agave system employs current technology and is eminently suitable as a replacement to our current CMS. It will address all of the shortcomings of our current system. It has an updated, user friendly interface that will help staff with their tasks. It has uses modern database standards to address our issues of reliability and dependability. The impact of implementing the Agave system will be immediate to us with tangible and intangible benefits to our court and county.

**Q6. How is overall project risk reduced through implementing the exception rather than the state standard?**

A6. Score your project risk for both the standard and the exception solutions on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest risk. Comment as appropriate to explain your assessment or the difference in scores in each category. Refer to supplementary instructions that appear in Section IV.B. of the JPIJ (long version) to view detailed risk information.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Standard score</i>	<i>Exception score</i>	<i>Description</i>
1. Strategic	1	1	Aligns with Court and Statewide Enterprise Architecture, goals, objectives, policies, standards and IT strategic plan.
Comment: The Agave system does align with court and statewide EAS goals, objectives, policies, standards and IT strategic plan. The Pima County Superior Court, Clerk of the Superior Court and AOC are working cooperatively on AZTurboCourt eFiling and JOLTZaz projects			
2. Management	2	1	Senior and intermediate management is involved in, and supports, the project. A steering committee/project team is in place.
Comment: Senior management is involved in and more supportive of the Agave system than the standard system. A steering committee is in place that includes senior managers, court administrator and presiding judge.			
3. Operational	3	2	Adverse effects on current operations are unlikely or contingency plans are in place. Supports Agency Performance Measures.
Comment: There is a higher risk with the state standard because there are more agencies involved and more groups affected. We are what unaware of contingency plans are in place. The Agave system will support agency performance measures.			
4. Scope and Requirements	3	2	Scope and requirements are, or will be, clearly defined and approved. Effect on business processes has been assessed.
Comment: The Agave system is a complete, finished product installed for the Clerk of the Court and Superior Court. Scope, requirements and the effect on business processes have been better assessed for Agave than for the state standard.			
5. Technologies Competency	1	1	Agency has available, or will secure appropriate skills to implement the project. Organizational readiness has been assessed.
Comment: Our court has appropriate skills to implement the project, and there are available contractors with the necessary skills.			
6. Infrastructure Dependencies	2	2	All key elements are included to fully implement the project. No additional costs are anticipated to deliver benefits.
Comment: The court has all key elements to fully implement the project. We have contingency fees available to cover unanticipated costs.			

## **Appendix A. Roles and Responsibilities**

Provide the names, job titles and responsibilities of all the personnel involved in the project. These may include the Project Sponsor, Project Manager (Technical Project Manager, Business Project Manager), programmer, analyst, and consultant(s). If new FTEs or consultants will be hired, indicate “new.” You may also include a Change Management manager, and user personnel involved in acceptance testing. When a role pertains to ONLY the state standard or the proposed exception, please indicate that, as well.

### ***Implementation Committee***

(Meets weekly)

Keith Bee, PCCJC Presiding Judge

Lisa Royal, Court Administrator

Doug Kooi, Deputy Court Administrator

Barbara Daniels, Court Operations Manager

Micci Tilton, Court Operations Manager

Charles Drake, Information Technology Manager

### ***Subject Matter Experts***

- Cross-functional integration, quality assurance, testing – Elvia Cariño
- Criminal case processing – Micci Tilton, Farris Burke
- Traffic case processing – Micci Tilton, Ralph Garcia
- Judicial/Courtroom Services – Micci Tilton, Nancy Custer, Judge Maria Felix
- Civil case processing– Barbara Daniels, Ann Neuman
- Records, OnBase – Barbara Daniels, Jane Carter
- Statistical Reports – Lisa Royal, Barbara Daniels, Micci Tilton
- Finance – Doug Kooi, Jeannie Patino
- IVR integration – Micci Tilton, Ralph Garcia
- Website integration – Lisa Royal, Doug Kooi, Jeannie Patino, Micci Tilton
- Security – Brandon Kimmel
- Case creation, case load balancing – Micci Tilton, Barbara Daniels, Jane Carter, Ralph Garcia

### ***IT Staff***

- Charles Drake, IT Manager
- Jesse Hamberger, Programmer Analyst, Senior
- Roger Emery, Programmer Analyst
- Pradip Patel, Programmer Analyst
- Tom Sandidge, Database Administrator
- Mark Dickinson, System Administrator
- Aleks Panić, Technical Support Specialist, Senior
- Mary Rhodes, Help Desk Support
- IT Interns

## Appendix B. Itemized List with Costs

Attach a detailed list of planned expenditures including unit costs and extensions. Ensure the total agrees with the TOTAL column on tables labeled “Development Costs for Current State Standard,” “Operating Costs for Current State Standard,” “Development Costs for Proposed Exception,” and “Operating Costs for Proposed Exception.” This list should contain all items associated with the total project investment, including hardware purchase costs, software purchase costs, software licensing costs, FTE and ERE costs, professional and outside services costs, consulting costs, communication costs, facilities costs such as cabling or wiring, training costs, travel costs, and all other costs.

### Development Costs for Current State Standard

<i>The development costs in thousands (\$000)</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY13-14</i>	<i>FY14-15</i>	<i>FY15-16</i>	<i>FY16-17</i>	<i>FY17-18</i>	<i>Total*</i>
IT FTE COST	\$100	\$100				\$200
User FTE COST: Subject Matter Experts	\$19†	\$18				\$37
IT Services: AmCad Services	\$150	\$150				\$300
Licensing and Maintenance Fees: AmCad	\$12‡	\$12				\$24
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$280</b>	<b>\$280</b>				<b>\$561</b>

† IT and User FTE are maximum budgeted.

‡ Estimate includes AmCad’s quote for system annual support on a test/dev system.

### Operating Costs for Current State Standard

<i>The operating costs in thousands (\$000)</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY13-14</i>	<i>FY14-15</i>	<i>FY15-16</i>	<i>FY16-17</i>	<i>FY17-18</i>	<i>Total*</i>
IT FTE COST	\$474§	\$485	\$597	\$609	\$621	\$2786
IT Services: Current, AmCad and OnBase	\$26	\$26	\$50*	\$50	\$50	\$202
AmCad Annual Support Fee			\$120±	\$126	\$132	\$378
OnBase Maintenance Fees	\$13	\$13	\$13	\$13	\$13	\$65
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$513</b>	<b>\$524</b>	<b>\$780</b>	<b>\$798</b>	<b>\$816</b>	<b>\$3,431</b>

§ This following years assume a 2% increase per year in total FTE costs of wages and benefits. The first two years are reduced by \$100K each due to development.

\* Estimate is based on AOC approved change requests and contracted through AmCad and OSAM. Support for current CMS, \$26,000, will be discontinued.

± Estimate is based on AmCad system annual support quoted to Mesa Municipal Court

## Development Costs for Proposed Exception

<i>The development costs in thousands (\$000)</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY12-13</i>	<i>FY13-14</i>	<i>FY14-15</i>	<i>FY15-16</i>	<i>FY16-17</i>	<i>Total*</i>
IT FTE COST	\$100	\$100				\$200
User FTE COST: Subject Matter Experts	\$19†	\$18				\$37
IT Services: 9 Contractors	\$133	\$132				\$265
Software: Dev Xpress	\$2					\$2
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$254</b>	<b>\$250</b>				<b>\$504</b>

† IT and User FTE are maximum budgeted.

## Operating Costs for Proposed Exception

<i>The operating costs in thousands (\$000)</i>						
<i>Description</i>	<i>FY13-14</i>	<i>FY14-15</i>	<i>FY15-16</i>	<i>FY16-17</i>	<i>FY17-18</i>	<i>Total*</i>
IT FTE COST	\$474§	\$485	\$597	\$609	\$621	\$2986
IT Services, Current CMS	\$26	\$26*				\$52
OnBase Maintenance Fees	\$13	\$13*				\$13
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$513</b>	<b>\$524</b>	<b>\$597</b>	<b>\$609</b>	<b>\$621</b>	<b>\$2,864</b>

§ This following years assume a 2% increase per year in total FTE costs of wages and benefits. The first two years are reduced by \$100K each due to development.

\* Current CMS support and OnBase will be discontinued with implementation of Agave.



## **Document Information**

Title: Exception Request Document based on Judicial Project Investment Justification Version 1.0  
Originator: Arizona Supreme Court, January 2005  
Date: March 2010 (editorial changes)  
Download: [http://www.supreme.state.az.us/cot/Documents/Documents\\_default.htm](http://www.supreme.state.az.us/cot/Documents/Documents_default.htm)  
Contact: Alicia Moffatt, 602-452-3791, email: [amoffatt@courts.az.gov](mailto:amoffatt@courts.az.gov)